

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
P039694P0

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No. PCT/JP2006/302617	International filing date (day/month/year) 15.02.2006	Priority date (day/month/year) 12.05.2005
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant
MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/302617

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed

☐ the translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rule 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ on paper

☐ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in the international application as filed

☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/302617

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-11</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>3, 8-11</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1, 2, 4-7</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-11</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: Microfilm of the specification and drawings annexed to the request of Japanese Utility Model Application No. 72642/1983 (Laid-open No. 176771/1984), (Mitsubishi Electric Corp.) 26 November 1984, Page 4, lines 2 to 19; Figs. 3 and 4 (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 2: Microfilm of the specification and drawings annexed to the request of Japanese Utility Model Application No. 171032/1982 (Laid-open No. 76074/1984), (Morimatsu Denshi Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha) 23 May 1984, Page 1, line 19 to page 2, line 2; Fig. 1 (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 3: JP 2004-98174 A (Fanuc Ltd.), 02 April 2004, Fig. 2 & US 2004/52630 A1, Fig. 2, & EP 1396314 A1, Fig. 2</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2003-25270 A (Nachi-Fujikoshi Corp.), 29 January 2003, Paragraph 0014; Fig. 1 (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 5: JP 11-129070 A (Kawasaki Heavy Industries, Ltd.), 18 May 1999, Paragraph 0008; Fig. 1 (Family: none)</p>			

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box V

The inventions of claims 1, 4, and 5 do not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. Adopting the connector described in document 2 in place of the terminal block described in document 1 would be easy for a person skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 2 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 to 3 cited in the ISR. Adopting the connector described in document 2 in place of the terminal block described in document 1 would be easy for a person skilled in the art. Connection of the plurality of external devices described in document 4 to the robot described in document 1 also would be easy for a person skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 6 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1, 2, and 4 cited in the ISR. Adopting the connector described in document 2 in place of the terminal block described in document 1 would be easy for a person skilled in the art. Further, using the cable having a plurality of wire types as described in document 5, in place of the cable of the robot described in document 1 also would be easy for a person skilled in the art.

The invention of claim 7 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1 to 3 cited in the ISR. For the robot described in document 1, the connection between inside cable and external devices can be changed by changing the connection at the terminal block. Then adopting the connector described in document 2 in place of the terminal block described in document 1 would be easy for a person skilled in the art. Connecting the plurality of external devices described in document 3 to the robot described in document 1 also would be easy for a person skilled in the art.

The inventions of claims 3 and 8 to 11 are not described in any one of the documents cited in the ISR, and they are not obvious to a person skilled in the art.